

Application Number 10/650,497

Amendment in response to Final Office Action mailed February 3, 2009

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions and listings of claims in the application.

Listing of Claims:

Claim 1 (Previously Presented): A method comprising:

prioritizing, with a prioritization engine, events obtained from interrogation of a medical device implanted in a patient, wherein the events include therapy events and diagnostic events, and wherein the prioritization engine is external to the patient; and

presenting, with a user interface device, a list of the events based on the prioritization.

Claim 2 (Original): The method of claim 1, further comprising:

prioritizing events obtained from a plurality of medical devices implanted in different patients; and

presenting a list of the patients and a list of the events for each of the patients based on the prioritization.

Claim 3 (Original): The method of claim 1, wherein prioritizing events includes prioritizing the events based on a relative importance associated with the events.

Claim 4 (Original): The method of claim 1, further comprising invoking a special action in response to an event with a relative importance that exceeds a threshold.

Claim 5 (Original): The method of claim 4, wherein the special action comprises using a conspicuous text format when presenting data from the event.

Claim 6 (Original): The method of claim 5, wherein the conspicuous text format includes one of font, bold text, highlighted text, underlined text, and italicized text.

Application Number 10/650,497

Amendment in response to Final Office Action mailed February 3, 2009

Claim 7 (Original): The method of claim 4, wherein the special action includes generating an alarm, notifying a clinician, and notifying a patient.

Claim 8 (Previously Presented): A method comprising:

interrogating, with a remote monitor, a medical device implanted in a patient to obtain event data;

receiving, with a prioritization engine, the event data from the remote monitor, wherein the event data describes one of a therapy event and a diagnostic event, and wherein the prioritization engine is external to the patient; and

assigning, with the prioritization engine, a relative importance to each of the events.

Claim 9 (Original): The method of claim 8, further comprising prioritizing events obtained from the interrogation based on the relative importance.

Claim 10 (Original): The method of claim 8, further comprising assigning the relative importance based on a set of rules.

Claim 11 (Original): The method of claim 8, further comprising presenting a prioritized list of the events based on the relative importance.

Claim 12 (Original): The method of claim 8, further comprising:

prioritizing events obtained from a plurality of medical devices implanted in different patients; and

presenting a list of the patients and a prioritized list of the events for each of the patients based on the relative importance.

Claim 13 (Currently Amended): The method of claim 8, further comprising invoking a special action in response to an event with a[[n]] relative importance that exceeds a threshold.

Claim 14 (Original): The method of claim 13, wherein the special action comprises using a conspicuous text format when presenting data from the event.

Application Number 10/650,497

Amendment in response to Final Office Action mailed February 3, 2009

Claim 15 (Original): The method of claim 14, wherein the conspicuous text format includes one of bold text, highlighted text, underlined text, and italicized text.

Claim 16 (Original): The method of claim 13, wherein the special action includes generating an alarm, notifying a clinician, and notifying a patient.

Claim 17 (Previously Presented): A system comprising:

a prioritization engine to prioritize events obtained from interrogation of a medical device implanted in a patient, wherein the events include therapy events and diagnostic events, and wherein the prioritization engine is external to the patient; and

a user interface device to present a list of the events based on the prioritization.

Claim 18 (Original): The system of claim 17, further comprising a data management application that parses raw data from the implantable medical device, and populates fields of a database with event data.

Claim 19 (Original): The system of claim 18, wherein the event data comprises one of patient name, device type, date event data was parsed, and event type.

Claim 20 (Original): The system of claim 17, further comprising a database to store the prioritized events, wherein the user interface device includes a web browser to access the prioritized events via a network connection.

Claim 21 (Original): The system of claim 20, further comprising a derivation engine to generate additional events based on the stored events.

Claim 22 (Original): The system of claim 17, further comprising a rule engine to assign relative importance to the events based on rules from a rule database.

Application Number 10/650,497

Amendment in response to Final Office Action mailed February 3, 2009

Claim 23 (Original): The system of claim 17, wherein the prioritization engine prioritizes events obtained from a plurality of medical devices implanted in different patients, and the user interface presents a list of the patients and a list of the events for each of the patients based on the prioritization.

Claim 24 (Original): The system of claim 17, wherein the prioritization engine prioritizes the events based on a relative importance associated with the events.

Claim 25 (Original): The system of claim 17, further comprising a notification device to perform a special action in response to an event with relative importance that exceeds a threshold, wherein the relative importance is assigned to the event based on a level of priority for the event.

Claim 26 (Original): The system of claim 25, wherein the special action comprises one of using a conspicuous text format when presenting data from the event.

Claim 27 (Original): The system of claim 26, wherein the conspicuous text format includes one of bold text, highlighted text, underlined text, and italicized text.

Claim 28 (Original): The system of claim 25, wherein the special action includes generating an alarm, notifying a clinician, and notifying a patient.

Claim 29 (Previously Presented): A computer-readable medium comprising instructions for causing a programmable processor to:

prioritize events obtained from interrogation of a medical device implanted in a patient, wherein the events include therapy events and diagnostic events; and

present a list of the events based on the prioritization, wherein the programmable processor is external to the patient.

Application Number 10/650,497

Amendment in response to Final Office Action mailed February 3, 2009

Claim 30 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 29, wherein the instructions cause the processor to:

prioritize events obtained from a plurality of medical devices implanted in different patients; and

present a list of the patients and a list of the events for each of the patients based on the prioritization.

Claim 31 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 29, wherein the instructions cause the processor to prioritize events based on a relative importance associated with the events.

Claim 32 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 29, wherein the instructions cause the processor to invoke a special action in response to an event with relative importance that exceeds a threshold.

Claim 33 (Previously Presented): A computer-readable medium comprising instructions for causing a programmable processor to:

interrogate a medical device implanted in a patient;

receive event data, wherein the event data describes one of a therapy event and a diagnostic event; and

assign a relative importance to each event, wherein the programmable processor is external to the patient.

Claim 34 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 33, wherein the instructions cause the processor to prioritize events obtained from interrogation based on relative importance.

Claim 35 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 33, wherein the instructions cause the processor to assign the relative importance based on a set of rules.

Claim 36 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 33, wherein the instructions cause the processor to present a list of the events based on the prioritization.

Application Number 10/650,497

Amendment in response to Final Office Action mailed February 3, 2009

Claim 37 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 33, wherein the instructions cause the processor to:

prioritize events obtained from a plurality of medical devices implanted in different patients; and

present a list of the patients and a prioritized list of the events for each of the patients based on relative importance.

Claim 38 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 33, wherein the instructions cause the processor to invoke a special action in response to an event with a relative importance that exceeds a threshold, wherein the relative importance is assigned to the event based on a level of priority for the event.

Claim 39 (Previously Presented): A device comprising:

a prioritization engine to prioritize events obtained from interrogation of a medical device implanted in a patient, wherein the events include therapy events and diagnostic events, and wherein the prioritization engine is external to the patient; and

a database to store the prioritized events.

Claim 40 (Previously Presented): The device of claim 39, further comprising a data management application that parses raw data from the implantable medical device, and populates fields of the database with event data.

Claim 41 (Previously Presented): The device of claim 39, wherein the event data comprises one of patient name, device type, date event data was parsed, and event type.

Claim 42 (Previously Presented): The device of claim 39, further comprising a derivation engine to generate additional events based on the stored events.

Claim 43 (Previously Presented): The device of claim 39, further comprising a rule engine to assign relative importance to the events based on rules from a rule database, wherein the prioritization engine prioritizes the events based on the relative importance.

Application Number 10/650,497

Amendment in response to Final Office Action mailed February 3, 2009

Claim 44 (Currently Amended): The device of claim 39[[17]], wherein the prioritization engine prioritizes events obtained from a plurality of medical devices implanted in different patients.